

Physician Dana,

7/18/72

Heal thyself!

You've copped out and seek to use me as your scapegoat.

I don't know what notes you took when you came to my hotel room, but I'm sure you were not interested in my finely-chiselled acquiesce profile, or in the coming TV show in your notes. I told you of John's letters and specific things you'd find in them that could be investigated in the search for new evidence.

When I saw John, learned that he had a court-appointed lawyer who had filed a petition cert to the Supreme Court, and I told you his name and address and probably phone number and suggested you speak to him and read the CA decision and his petition cert. I repeated this at least once. You complain about the lack of specifics. Could anything be more specific or more obvious than reading these two things?

I told you of the transcript, another obvious thing and no less specific.

I told you of an alleged FBI search and seizure without warrant, carried out at John's residence. If there was a warrant, there is also a return on it. If there was no warrant and what John says was there was seized was, in fact, taken illegally and was not available to defense counsel, I would hope, as best a non-lawyer can, that this would meet the "new-evidence" rule and frustrate a terrible precedent in which, despite your protestations of principle, you appear to have no interest. Its widest application, as I suggested, may well be in the kinds of political cases you say concern you.

These should be enough specific cases for you to confront yourself and your complaint.

It is right and proper that youth enjoy itself when it can. That, however, is something less than a full-time preoccupation with men of principle. You could have read the CA decision and petition in between pleasures, when sitting home, if you sit home any nights. In this connection you might consider your own words, "Life is simply too short for me to waste it." This, of course, involves a definition of "waste". I do not consider pursuit of principle wasting time.

You might also consider this line as it relates to me as I am about to enter my 70th decade, especially in dealings with younger people like you. I have too little time left for kissing or wiping asses and none at all for diapering.

If you were holding the tapes of the Frank show and all the irrelevancies Stoner introduced "to initiate anyone unfamiliar", you were, indeed, hopelessly lost, had done no thinking at all, or both.

It is childish to tell me to "feel free to expose my incompetence" and irrelevant at this late date to ask "how many of those law students are...still willing to put the work that is required into the case." The first does not interest me and the second you were supposed to have tended to before they left for the summer. Obviously, no constructive purpose is served by such futilities. And I don't believe I called you a liar.

This letter may be a futility. As an older man I take the time with one younger in the hope that he will search himself. It neither helps nor hurt me either way. I think you owe it to yourself, especially if you want to assume the obligations of a lawyer, and most of all if in political cases. Otherwise, you'll be salting people away from the other side, just as Stoner did. I don't think you want to do that.

No hard feelings. You are not the first to waste time for me. If I never find it welcome and can't make it up, it is always more unpleasant when it comes from the self-proclaimed principled, too many of whom find too many pleasures more important than doing something about principle. Principle becomes pink-tea talk, no more. Meanwhile, I repeat that I think you and the others missed a rare opportunity. If you can take time from the ~~enjoyment~~ enjoyment of the pleasures of life to give me the names and addresses of the two cause lawyers you mentioned, I'd appreciate it. At some time in the future one of us might want to contact them. Sorry fun kept you from getting me the CA decision and petition. Hampo hasn't sent either and the lawyers did ask. Sincerely,